

APPROVED

Amesbury Conservation Commission

July 18, 2016 at 6:30 PM

City Hall Auditorium, 62 Friend Street

Amesbury, MA

Meeting called to order at 6:35 P.M.

Present: Alan Corey, Kinsey Boehl, Suzanne Egan, Steve Langlois, Adrienne Lennon.

Absent: None

Also Present: John Lopez, Agent; Joan Baptiste, Recording Secretary and Transcription

MINUTES:

June 20, 2016

Motion to approve the June 20, 2016 meeting minutes by Kinsey Boehl, seconded by Suzanne Egan. AIF.

~~

Administrative:

Ordinance/Bill #2016-028: Open Space, Natural Resources, and Trails Committee (Sherwood)

Municipal Council **Jonathan Sherwood** briefly summarized the establishment of the committee and hands out information to the Commission that acts as an advisory committee to Mayor and Council and other municipal boards. Seven member board, 2 Council, 1 Planning Board, 1 Conservation Commission, 3 general public. Main objective to complete the Open Space and Recreation Plan. They hope to establish a management plan to maintain and connect the 1200 acres of open space in the city.

Motion by Suzanne Egan to appoint Adrienne Lennon as a representative from Conservation Commission. Second by Alan Corey. AIF

~~

Whittier Hill-Friend Street Acquisition by Greenbelt - Update (ECGA/Johnson-Hall)

Vanessa Johnson – Hall, Assistant Director of Land Conservation at Greenbelt: (Handout) Greenbelt was able to acquire the 21 acre property on Whittier Hill – it's called the Whittier Hill / Friend Street Property. In close proximity to Woodsom Farm. Parking at the end of Whitcher Court. In negotiation with property owner that owns the property between Whittier Hill and Woodsom Farm. This is our attempt to protect Amesbury's last unprotected, undeveloped ridge top in the city. We have until the end of December to raise \$200,000 to acquire the property (Whittier Hill). Submitted a Conservation Partnership grant to the state for \$85,000.

~

Merrimack River Watershed Forum (Egan)

Commissioner **Suzanne Egan** attended forums that discussed the Merrimack River considered one of the most endangered rivers in the United States. They noted the importance of looking at the growth, development and planning of the river on a local level. Commissioner Egan would like the commission to sponsor an educational forum for conservation commissions along the river to discuss the status and what can be done to protect it. She would be willing to do the organizing. Best time to do it end of February early March. One day and invite local conservation commissions.

Motion by Suzanne Egan that the Amesbury Conservation Commission sponsor an educational forum for local conservation commissions abutting the Merrimack River to discuss regional watershed planning and regulation. Second by Adrienne Lennon. AIF

Amended Enforcement Order (002-0969) 37 Middle Road (Anderson)

Restoration of area in compliance.

John Lopez: This is pursuant to a violation under the local bylaw for the filling in an isolated vegetated wetland. The applicant was required to restore it to a fully functioning status by June 30, 2016 or by date otherwise specified by DEP.

Bob Prokop, Wetland Consultants restoration of area in compliance with the plans. Distributes a series of photos that shows the area being restored which will be monitored for the next 5 years. Mr. Prokop will be submitting yearly reports.

Motion by Suzanne Egan to take continued business item for 37 Middle Road request of OOC extension out of order. Second by Alan Corey AIF

Michael Leach: Stantec project has been partially constructed. Water, sewer, drainage have been installed. Roadway has not but as part of the project they will install a box culvert.

Suzanne Egan: Are you recommending that we ask for a more detailed plan?

Michael Leach: that would be appropriate – more detail on the existing conditions. The original plan was drawn in 2009.

Suzanne Egan: Is that with regards to the entire project or just with the reconstruction of the middle road and the replacement and construction of the new culvert.

Michael Leach for Middle Rd: That was one of the off site improvements that was proposed for the project.

Suzanne Egan: Anything else that you would recommend that the commission seek?

Michael Leach: Once they have that information and the design it would be helpful to incorporate what's being done right now and then if there is additional impacts associated with that.

Steve Langlois: Will this be done by November December?

Bob Prokop: I don't know what their plan is for the detail. It was my understanding that the construction sequence was submitted to the planning board. I have not seen it. This was set up by the contractor who did the wetland restoration. My involvement with the project only related to the restoration effort. Currently we can not do any more work unless we are granted a time extension.

APPROVED

Steve Langlois: Can we extend and have them submit revised plans with detail within that time frame?

Suzanne Egan: Is this being reviewed for planning board?

John Lopez: Currently going through review with the Planning board by Stantec.

Bob Prokop: When this project was originally approved in 2008/09 DEP did approve the culvert replacement and whatever impacts were associated with it.

John Lopez (received email from City Planner): The subdivision plan does not show the detail of culvert.

Suzanne Egan: When can we expect the detailed plans?

Motion by Suzanne Egan to grant a 3 month extension of the Order of Conditions to 11/7/2016 with the condition that the applicant submit revised plans for the culvert with detail and associated mitigation on the abutting wetlands sufficient enough for Stantec to provide a review and a recommendation to the commission to approve an extension for the time that is necessary to complete the project, second by Alan Corey. AIF

~

Briefing – Amesbury Heights, 36 Haverhill Road (002-0936) (Boston North Properties, LLC)
Connor Nagle, VHB will be taking the roll as Environmental Monitor for the project.

Continued Business:

NOI (002-1146) 72 Lake Attitash (Arling)

Matt Steinel, Millennium Engineering: Mill River has reviewed the project, we've done a site walk with Mill River and Dan provided some changes and notes to be added to the plan. We have made the changes and resubmitted all to Mill River.

Dan Ottenheimer, Mill River: We have reviewed the project which consists of house re construction and other site improvements. We feel it is an improvement to the current condition. Our recommendation is to consider issuing an order of conditions.

Abutters:

Luke Guttadauro, 73 Lake Attitash Road: I'm okay with the existing dwelling being renovated. A couple of problems I have with the plan is there are no dimensions listed on the plans for the driveway, the pavers out front as well as what will be used for pavers. Moving the driveway from the existing location which is about three to four spots to the other side which will not provide any additional parking.

Matt Steinel: The board has been furnished with a new set of plans as a result of the review by

Dan Ottenheimer: Dimensions are on the plan now. Parking spots – the pavement on the other side of garage will be removed. We proposed three spots on the other side of garage. We are not proposing any increase parking. We did not specify any type of pavers but they will be pervious. Fill materials brought onto the site will be clean.

APPROVED

Carole Young, 71 Lake Attitash Rd: Our concern is the toxic runoff that is a problem all over the lake. The grass lot which will be used for parking pavers is the only area to keep water from running off the site into the lake. Question the use of concrete at the lake.

Matt Steinel: Removing the pavement of the existing parking area will create a reduction of impervious area.

Steve Langlois: What is the reduction?

Matt Steinel: Asphalt is 1,070 sq. ft existing; we are removing all and replace 622 sq ft of pervious pavers.

Kinsey Boehl: Planting plan shows more plantings than existing.

Suzanne Egan: You don't have a note that specifically calls out impervious (existing) and impervious area (proposed). It would be helpful to have it on the plan

John Lopez: I would like our consultant, Mr. Ottenheimer, to reiterate that he concurs with the applicant's representative that the water quality will not differ or will not result in a deleterious impact as a result of this project

Dan Ottenheimer: I absolutely concur the risk that exists today is erosion into the lake and that is going to be abated with the planting scheme that they have developed. We have provided the agent with a draft order of conditions.

Motion by Kinsey Boehl to approve the NOI for 72 Lake Attitash 002-1146 and issue a draft order of conditions from the City's consultant, second by Alan Corey. AIF

Motion by Kinsey Boehl to close hearing, second by Alan Corey. AIF

~~

Chairman Langlois announces the continuation of four items:

NOI (002-1132) 5 Merrill Street (Linden) (continued to September 19)

NOI (002-1139) Riverfront Drive & 59 Pleasant Valley Road Map 110, Lot 4A (Desmarais) (continued to September 19)

NOI (002-1141) Village at Bailey's Pond (Fafard Development) (continued to September 19)

NOI (002-1147) 9 - 13 South Hampton Road (Quintal) (continued to September 19)

~~

NOI (002-1142) 78 Lake Attitash Road (Buscanera)

John Lopez: This is a result of an enforcement order.

Michael Seekamp, Seekamp Environmental Consulting representing Vincent Buscanera owner of 78 Lake Attitash.

Have proposed high bush blueberry plantings and a conservation seed mix on the waterfront.

Dan Ottenheimer, Mill River Consulting: We reviewed the project which consists of a foundation expansion, a house reconstruction and other site improvements. All work is proposed in the buffer zone, no work is proposed in the resource area. There is a heightened level of scrutiny associated because it is an outstanding resource the applicant has met the standards for proceeding. Overall application contains a hodgepodge of materials, plans and reports. Initially

it did not fully explain the previous activities and proposed activities; it did not explain clearly what was to occur. It did not explain how the project was going to be managed and it didn't propose any mitigation for the new work. We have address many of the items and as of today received more specifically related to plantings and mitigation. We need to assess whether the commission is comfortable with what they are proposing with respect to that. If that gets resolved we may be able to issue an order of conditions for this project. Information comes in dribs and drabs and it's hard to assess it comprehensively.

Suzanne Egan: What we are trying to do as a commission is to protect the lake. From the last proposal that planting plan works to ...

Michael Seekamp: The difference between this and the last plan is that there is no degraded bank on this property. No evidence of existing erosion. What was there before construction happened was lawn. We are willing to give that up and plant wildlife plantings. We have to put something under the blueberries. You could have mulch, pavers or you could have native vegetation like a conservation seed mix. That is what we are proposing.

Kinsey Boehl: The plan shows a dumpster on the water's edge. Is there a note anywhere that it is to be removed?

Michael Seekamp: It's on the proposed site plan and it's up by the street.

Suzanne Egan: If you look at the plan for 72 Lake Attitash Road there is a ground cover that is proposed and are included in the planting plan and not just a seed mix. There needs to be a planting plan that we can rely on in six months.

Michael Seekamp: A conservation seed mix is much better erosion control than shrubs or ground cover. It provides much better friction for the water to be absorbed into the soil than with shrubs.

It includes grasses and clover and trefoil. It grows thick and it has many stems that slows water down.

Dan Ottenheimer: The only document we have seen is regarding blueberry bushes. In our opinion we don't want them leaving bare soil. We want them to develop a strategy. We don't think the blueberry bushes are an adequate strategy.

Steve Langlois: What would be an adequate strategy?

Dan Ottenheimer: The commissioner brought up an earlier application where a botanist developed a comprehensive landscape plan with different heights and different native species that would attract wildlife that would provide for erosion mitigation that would essentially enhance the natural resource characteristics of the property.

Adrienne Lennon: It looks like they are looking for a lawn around the blueberry bushes. In terms of the argument about wildlife and pollinators, that will be mowed and there is no guarantee that the seed mix will be dense enough to do any water retention.

Michael Seekamp: We are not going to mow this – it's a no disturb zone.

Adrienne Lennon: I would be more comfortable with a native wildflower mix that's going to come in quite a bit more densely and more quickly than grass and for those reasons also create more habitats.

Michael Seekamp: We would be happy to include more wildflowers in the mix.

Adrienne Lennon: A native wildflower mix would be fine.

Kinsey Boehl: I would recommend that we get a planting plan.

Motion by Suzanne Egan to continue this item to the August 1st with the expectation that the applicant will have submitted a proposed planting plan consistent with the regulations

APPROVED

to be reviewed by Mill River and have a draft order of conditions to act on at that meeting, second by Kinsey Boehl. AIF.

RCoC (002-1127) 78 Lake Attitash Road (Buscanera)

Motion by Suzanne Egan to continue RCOC for 78 Lake Attitash to August 1, second by Kinsey Boehl. AIF

NOI (002-xxxx) 31 Pleasant Valley Road (Stockwood) taken out of order

Enforcement Order – 31 Pleasant Valley Road (Stockwood)

John Lopez: Waiting for DEP#. This is the result of an enforcement order issue to the property owner for the removal of an asphalt driveway and repaving in kind. The enforcement order required the submission of an NOI. The repaving project was within the same footprint of the existing driveway.

Beth Stockwood, 31 Pleasant Valley Road: I didn't know we needed a permit.

Motion by Suzanne Egan to continue to August 1 and have the agent draft an order of conditions. Second by Alan Corey. AIF

New Business:

RCoC (002-1145) 75 Whitehall Road (Cynewski)

John Lopez: This is for the installation of a dock. No outstanding issues.

Motion by Suzanne Egan to approve the Request for Certificate of Compliance and issue a Certificate of Compliance for 75 Whitehall Road. Second by Kinsey Boehl. AIF

~~

NOI (002-1148) 445 - 447 Main Street (Britton) Bill Decie – Kairos Environmental

John Lopez: This is for a proposed dock.

Bill Decie - Representing Britton LLC

The project is for the placement of a personal docking float. We are constructing a small 6'x4' platform in the riverfront area just to attach the gangway. And the other resource area is the bottom of the river which was reviewed by Natural Heritage and they have no problems with that.

Alan Corey: Do we have an attachment for Natural Heritage?

Bill Decie: I have it here. The project is also under review by the Corps of Engineers.

The last page is the approved plantings approved by DEP and this commission. Comment from DEP is regarding special condition #26 from the superseding Order of Condition that the banks are to be checked before we do any further work. This was done over a year ago and forwarded to DEP. I have sent this to Heidi Davis. The second question from DEP was where the dock will be stored. It will go up river to Marina at Hatter's Point.

John Lopez: DEP has a superseding Order of conditions which currently exists on the site for the construction of a single family house. One of the key questions was the stability of the riparian bank. Initially the applicant was to install a sheet pile between the bank and the house so if the bank continued to erode the sheet pile would curb any erosion. That was modified to modify the foundation that went deeper into the ground which negated the need to do the sheet piling. DEP also required an assessment of the bank to determine its stability and the erosion. Mr. Decie has just provided a letter to DEP (reads). The planting plan was to have been fully implemented by June 2010 and it was to have been monitored for two years. The concern that DEP has is the stability of the bank and that if a dock was placed on this bank would exacerbate any erosion.

Suzanne Egan: I would suggest that this be reviewed by a third party consultant and get all of the information necessary in line to see whether or not what was supposed to be complied with was complied with or not. If I look at this and it has a planting plan that was approved and was supposed to be planted in 2010 and is not planted at this point. And you say it couldn't be – but you want to put a dock in instead then I would say on the basis of that that this should be denied.

Alan Corey: The planting plan will be done at the same time as the dock.

Bill Decie: That's correct. That planting plan was carried from the planting plan that was approved by the Corp, DEP, went through review with Mary Rimmer, we had issues with abutter Mr. Purcell – he finally agreed to what we were doing, once we moved the gangway away from him he was pacified.

Alan Corey: And Jack Bailey also approved this plan.

Kinsey Boehl: The superseding order of conditions is still open and was to be closed in 2010. What's holding up the release of the SOOC?

Bill Decie: The house is incomplete. The house is still under construction which is why there have been no plantings. We will be requesting a Certificate of Compliance for the Superseding Order of Conditions in the fall.

Suzanne Egan: An abutter appealed our decision to issue an order of conditions to DEP.

Bill Decie: And there is no significant change from what the Amesbury Con Com approved to what the DEP has issued.

John Lopez reads DEP comments into the record. #26 Mr. Decie's letter states that existing river bank has not eroded.

Steve Langlois: If DEP still has issue

Bill Decie: We had to do #26 before we constructed the house. I would request that this is continued to August 1st so that we can get a response from DEP.

Motion by Kinsey Boehl to continue 445-447 Main Street to Aug 1 and look for clarification from DEP regarding the condition of the bank, second Suzanne Egan AIF

~~

RDA – 67 Pleasant Valley Road (Koplove)

John Lopez: This is a request for a negative determination to remove two mature Norway spruce trees located on the corner of the applicant's property. We have discussed replacement. The area is heavily forested. It is within 200 foot buffer zone to the Merrimac River.

APPROVED

Michael Koplove Applicant/homeowner of 67 Pleasant Valley Road: The problem is that it's leaning at a 70 degree angle. Provided photos. It's leaning towards our abutter at 59 PVR.

Motion by Kinsey Boehl to issue of a Negative Determination of Applicability at 67 Pleasant Valley Rd with a 2' x 3' sign that reads ACC 002-67 be installed visible from a public way during the duration of the work, second by Alan Corey. AIF

RDA – 12 Strathmere Club/95 Kimball Road (Jewell)

John Lopez: This is a request to amend an existing negative determination of applicability for a number of trees that were approved for removal. Modification request is to include an additional tree which has resulted in damage to property (\$6,000) to the applicant's house.

Michael Jewell: We will do additional plantings for the additional tree removal.

Motion by Kinsey Boehl to issue a negative determination of applicability at 95 Kimball Road, second by Suzanne Egan. AIF

5 minute break

RCoC – 126 Whitehall Road (Gilmore)

John Lopez: All the work has been done pursuant to the Order of Conditions.

Andy Gilmore: We've lived in the house for 15 years. We thought that the builder would have filed for it. We have had the survey done and it meets the OOC.

Motion by Suzanne Egan to issue a Certificate of Compliance for 126 Whitehall Road. Second by Kinsey Boehl. AIF

~~

RDA – 17 Gardner Street (Elkind)

Paul Elkind: A branch came down on our deck chairs. We have received an estimate from an arborist who states that the trees are diseased and should be taken down.

John Lopez: These trees are along the bank of Back River.

Paul Elkind: Right along my retaining wall.

Motion by Suzanne Egan to issue a negative determination for removal of tree 17 Gardner Street and that a 2' x 3' sign be installed reading ACC 002-17, Second by Kinsey Boehl. AIF

~~

NOI (002-xxxx) 385 - 386 Main Street (Shea)

Enforcement Order – 386 Main Street (Shea)

John Lopez: This notice of intent is part of the enforcement order issued. This is for the removal of an asphalt driveway, expansion of such with what we were originally told were pervious pavers. They turned out to be impervious. Also there were a number of trees that were removed being non-jurisdictional. There was also a tree in the front of the property which was jurisdictional and was removed by approval from the commission. The applicant has to compensate for the lack of pervious material; there is a proposal to install planting along the driveway edge. The commission is asked to consider the notice of intent required by the enforcement order and the enforcement order itself.

Tom Hughes – Hughes Environmental Consulting representing the Sheas.

There were trees in the way back, there was a tree growing up in the shed at the 200 foot limit of jurisdiction, there was also a tree about 4 feet into the property which was not removed as part of the work that the enforcement order was issued for. These were removed at the time that they bought the property just before occupancy. They tried to back out of the driveway and the tree was in the line of sight. They took it down without permission.

John Lopez: The tree may have been within the City limits.

Tom Hughes: The property line is approximately two feet behind the sidewalk. Based upon the oblique image that the base of the tree was more than 7 feet off the sidewalk.

Steve Langlois: How is it that we were told that the pavers would be pervious?

Tom Hughes: The landscapers said the water would go right through them. They were installed with a layer of sand underneath and sand in between. I've watched and the water goes through but they are not from an engineering standpoint pervious. We agreed to put in a trench drain as part of the work that will take any water that would run off the driveway. The driveway is pitched towards the trench.

Suzanne Egan: I thought this came to the commission under an enforcement order and the driveway had not yet been completed and the pavers were pervious. So we said go ahead and finish that work and thereafter file a notice of intent.

Tom Hughes: We came in May 2 and the work had begun on the driveway. John came out the prior week. The driveway was well under way to being constructed.

Suzanne Egan: So the May 2 meeting while the driveway was under construction the representation was made to the commission that it was all pervious material. There was a very strong urging from the applicant to be allowed to continue.

Tom Hughes: John felt that to leave the site in that condition posed a sedimentation risk and he felt it needed to be finished and stabilized.

Steve Langlois: The unfortunate thing is that the contractor doesn't know what a pervious paver is, the contractor didn't know it was within 200 feet of the river front, the tree guy didn't know that it was in a jurisdiction. So part of the problem is hiring people who don't know what they're doing. And who's fault is that?

Tom Hughes: Mistakes were made. Had I heard the word pervious earlier on I would have come in May 2 with specs on the pavers. What we did is just as effective as a porous driveway. And the ability of the water to actually be drawn away from the house.

John Lopez: There was another enforcement order issued with a cease and desist provision. The property owner dumped loam on the riparian bank. At the last meeting the commission

required the applicant to remediate and return the riparian bank to preconstruction activities. As built plans have been submitted that show it has been done.

Tom Hughes: Additional work that they are seeking approval for are on the river side. The timber steps are to be replaced and they want to reset stones that have loosened from water running down bank. On the other side, is all after the fact, the driveway, landscape area, trench drain, back yard that was resurfaced.

Kinsey Boehl: What is the change in the square footage?

Tom Hughes: On the river side it's zero change. On the 386 Main Street side there is a total increase of the pavers of 754 sq. ft. 209 sq ft is within the inner riparian.

Suzanne Egan: You are increasing from 0 to 4000 sq ft.

Tom Hughes: The area of the lawn that converted to paved driveway was 209 in the inner riparian and 487 in the outer riparian.

Steve Langlois: No matter how you look at the numbers there was an increase that we don't like to do.

Tom Hughes: We have made improvements, we planted the landscape.

Suzanne Egan: Do we have a planting plan? It would be helpful to have this plan reviewed to determine the impact that has been done here and what type of mitigation is appropriate on this property to provide some mitigation for all the work that has been done.

Abutter comments:

Joanne Gilbert, 382 Main Street: I was wondering about the replacement of concrete sidewalk to cobblestones which are irregular and uneven.

Kinsey Boehl: Perhaps the questions can be compiled and answered by third party.

Joanne Gilbert: It is an irregular surface as departure from town side walk.

John Lopez: It is city property, the DPW director.

Alan Corey: So the work that was done was not even on their property.

Tom Hughes: Mr. Shea was in touch with Rob Desmarais and he has been out to the site several times. We will talk to Public Works.

John Lopez: That's a good suggestion. We have nothing in writing from DPW.

Tracey Bradstreet, 388 Main Street: This is an improvement to the property.

John Lopez: There is some significant flooding that takes place in the roadway. I believe that the DPW was waiting for the new fiscal year to install a drain in that area.

Kinsey Boehl: I would like to make a motion to go out for third party review to Mill River for 385-386 Main Street NOI to determine what was done, the additional square footage and what the appropriate mitigation would be to compensate for that. Second by Suzanne Egan. AIF

Motion to continue to September 19th meeting, second by Kinsey Boehl. AIF

Tom Hughes: What is the status of the enforcement order?

Kinsey Boehl: When you go out to buy pavers does it determine if they are pervious?

Tom Hughes: The specs sheet will say.

Suzanne Egan: The enforcement order was to file an NOI but I'm a little concerned with the filing of the NOI that is not quite as complete as we would like it. I think we should keep the EO in place until they provide the additional information. We should receive a planting plan,

mitigation and then some of the facts on the driveway and the drainage plan and the storm water runoff.

John Lopez: Is the issue of the tree that was removed been discussed?

Kinsey Boehl: That should be looked at by third party. Is it included in the NOI?

Tom Hughes: I would like you to include it as part of the NOI.

John Lopez: There were some issues with the original plan. The abutter submitted some comments that you have received, they were forwarded to Mr. Hughes and he addressed them in a timely fashion and the amendments have been forwarded to the abutter she fully supports them.

Tom Hughes: Survey notes that covered her property. I've given John copies of that plan tonight. They have no bearing on the project to our request.

~~

NOI (002-xxxx) 58 West Greenwood Street (Alvarez)

Patrick Seekamp

John Lopez: DEP #002-1149 DEP as no comments.

Patrick Seekamp, Seekamp environmental consulting: My client is out of town. Single family house on West Greenwood Street, NOI for multi-faceted project. Mr. Alvarez has a deck that is attached to the back of his house that has pulled off the house and collapsed. Mr. Alvarez would like to build a slightly large sunroom addition in the location of the existing deck with a pervious patio. And then there is an existing garage that he wishes to demolish and reconstruct. Has a plan where the wetland is depicted. Has drawn a DEP BVW data sheet. Everything on the sketch that is not labeled in green (labeled wet meadow) is currently lawn. We have proposed erosion control. The corner of the garage is at least 35 feet from the wetland boundary. The proposed sun room, the existing deck and the bottom landing of the stairs is about 65 feet off existing wetland boundary. I've labeled the wetland that you see on the sketch as a wet meadow, there is a tree line and a more forested area off the Alvarez property. Cow Lane is on paper only. We have provided a supplemental architectural rendering. They propose to put a crawl space foundation under the sun room, right now it's a deck on pilings. They would also propose to take out a portion of that deck on pilings and create a patio area. The existing garage has an existing crawl space under it.

Alan Corey: I see an existing plan, I don't see a final plan.

Patrick Seekamp: They were submitted.

Suzanne Egan: We don't have a finished plan.

Patrick Seekamp: They are not shown on the sketch.

John Lopez: When Mr. Seekamp and I discussed this project he mentioned possibly drafting some sort of operations and maintenance plan on the wet meadow. I encouraged him to talk with his client to see if it was something that would be possible.

Patrick Seekamp: I did put together a wet meadow management for the benefit of the commission. Handout.

Kinsey Boehl: It would be helpful to have the 35 - 50 foot buffer zone.

Patrick Seekamp: There are two tupelo trees within the lawn area which will remain. The wet meadow, at sometime on this property, there was mowing to the shrub tree line. It's a wet area.

Steve Langlois (taps gavel): Excuse me sir, it's getting late and obviously we are not going to make a decision on this tonight. You've got some work to do. The wet meadow explanation

perhaps you can save to the next time. The wet meadow is not going to push this over the top, it's the plans. If the plans could be a little more descriptive of where the wetland is, where the structures are going.

Patrick Seekamp: I understand, where I was headed was – it was a concept that we were willing to offer up to the commission that has ecological benefit to the wetlands that were there. But I would be happy to discuss it next time.

Steve Langlois: This gentleman owns the wet meadow – so you will tell us how he will take care of the wet meadow on his property

Patrick Seekamp: I would propose to the commission that it is a concept that has benefit and so he doesn't need to do it...he could let it go...and he could leave it as is and it would reforest and become a shrub community and ultimately become a tree community. What he has now is a diverse stratification of from forested, shrub with bird habitat and nesting value to a wet meadow community that has a lot of forage and pollinator benefit; honeybees, butterflies, and insect habitat so it's a piece of the larger component. It's not a big area and in my opinion it got mowed because there is no trees and shrub development other than a few small shrubs. It probably gets mowed during drought years like now and that is why it's a wet meadow and not a shrub community. It's a concept that John and I had talked about and he thought it would be something that the commission might entertain.

Suzanne Egan: Is it larger than this?

Patrick Seekamp: The neighbors on either side have lawn.

Suzanne Egan: Is there any drainage plan?

Patrick Seekamp: There are down spouts and gutters.

Suzanne Egan: If you could put those on the plans.

Steve Langlois: So a deck has fallen down and now they want to put up a sunroom. It's beyond 50 feet so you can build a foundation.

Alan Corey: But there will be a roof so we'll need drainage.

Steve Langlois: But he doesn't have to drain the whole property?

Patrick Seekamp: I can put a note on the plan that shows the roof. If you want a survey plan I need to know it so that we can provide one.

Steve Langlois: If you are going to need one for the building inspector then we would like to see it.

John Lopez: You should talk to the building inspector about the age of the garage.

Motion by Kinsey Boehl to continue this to the August 1 meeting, second by Suzanne Egan. AIF

~~

RCoC – 56 - 58 South Hampton Road, Locke Hill, Lot 13 (Coulliard)

RCoC – 56 - 58 South Hampton Road, Locke Hill, Lot 4 (Coulliard)

Patrick Seekamp was asked by Mr. Coulliard to discuss the information that was submitted. I reviewed the lots in June and submitted a letter. They were vegetated, stable, etc. Lot 13 was well vegetated. Erosion control could be removed. Christianson and Sergie submitted an as built. Mr. Coulliard said that Dominic said that the lots were stable and it appeared that the work that was proposed to be done on lot 13 was completed according to the plan. BSC has been monitoring the project.

APPROVED

Suzanne Egan: We have an e-mail from BSC that states Lots 4 and 13 are okay but not lot 10.

Patrick Seekamp: They withdrew 10.

John Lopez: Have the granite bounds been noted on the plans?

Kinsey Boehl: Are they in the field?

Patrick Seekamp: I don't know. They were not in place for the others.

Kinsey Boehl: I'd recommend that we not approve until the granite bounds are installed.

John Lopez: The OOC plantings require a two year monitoring period with reports due no later than Nov. 30th of each year. I don't recall getting a report. The as-built plans are to be reviewed by BSC according to the OOC. We need to get a proposal from BSC to review the as-builts and I would say that could be done as soon as we get funding from Mr. Coulliard.

Motion by Kinsey Boehl to not approved the Request for lot 13 and we require a review by third party to confirm that granite bounds are in place, second by Suzanne Egan. AIF

Suzanne Egan: Why are you moving to deny instead of continuing it?

Motion by Suzanne Egan to rescind the denial for Lot 13, second by Kinsey Boehl. AIF

Motion by Kinsey Boehl to request review of as-built by BSC specifically the placement of granite bounds and continue 56-58 South Hampton Road, Lot 13 to September 19th, second by Suzanne Egan.

Motion by Kinsey Boehl to request review of as built by BSC specifically the placement of granite bounds and continue 56-58 South Hampton Road, Lot 4 to September 19th, second by Suzanne Egan.

Motion to adjourn was made by Kinsey Boehl and seconded by Suzanne Egan. AIF.

Meeting adjourned at 10:15 P.M.